423 /964 cont./
648 opposition for a long time has led to absolutely no result, the
797 Yamana have never given up their exclusive legal claim to their native region.

423 They trace this claim back to their so-called revolutionary
173 myth, which tells that in ancient times the women who were playing kina pushed into this region and continued their secret ceremony here. Since this time, they say, all the Yamana have remained in one and the same place, and inasmuch as they were the first to take possession of this land for themselves, it has become their property.

423 The nature of the landscape has divided the whole Yamana
635 territory into five large districts in which an equal number of dialects have developed (p. 199 /untranslated/). Each dialect group regards its home as, in a special sense, the common property of all its members. It is the field in which each one may devote himself to the hunt for food without restraint. To begin with, the individual has no vested right to a specific animal and no priority in obtaining special products of the land. Without discrimination, everything within the boundaries of the dialect region is available to everyone living there. Thus, with regard to the natural products of their circumscribed homeland, there is no personal property right; this becomes valid only at the moment when a person appropriates something for himself.

423 It is no less important to point out that only the members
635 of the same dialect group may take what their circumscribed
●685 area /965/ holds. Persons whose homes are in a neighboring district generally do not have the right to cross the boundaries. A few exceptional cases are regarded as legally valid. If these exceptions are misused, however, disputes may be kindled and, to be sure, precisely because of violation of the sovereign rights which only the actual owners of this region enjoy. They alone may indiscriminately appropriate in it whatever they need in the way of animals and goods, even if some of it serves in barter with people of another group.

It is obvious that every individual will defend the common possessions of his dialect group, to which he belongs by birth or marriage and in which he himself has a share. Whenever and wherever he observes encroachment by a neighbor, he at least disapproves of it and speaks of it to others in his immediate

/965 cont./

423 635 685 neighborhood. Sometimes the malefactor must atone dearly for his offensive violation of land rights. The Fuegians are even capable of ruthless intolerance toward him. The treatment accorded a certain Okokko may serve as an example. The missionaries with whom he had lived for many months on Isla Keppel wanted him to start a sort of "model farm," like the European prototype, in the center of the region of his countrymen, namely, in Liwya. This, however, was not his home. A small frame house was built for him and a goodly store of provisions left behind so that he could get along for about seven months. His nearest neighbors, however, would not tolerate him there, for, according to them, he was an intruder. They avenged the violation of their land rights in that "Okokko's house, and goats, and property, had been destroyed by fire" /cited in English/. In this case, envy doubtless intensified the mania for destruction (p. 297 /untranslated/).

423 635 Despite due recognition of the land rights belonging to each dialect group, certain circumstances have nevertheless created legally valid exceptions to the exclusion of one group by another. The basic idea holds for an emergency situation when all doors must be open to every member of the tribe from every direction. This applies first of all to the procurement of raw materials for objects which no one can do without. Uniform, thick beech trunks which furnish suitable pieces of bark for the canoe flourish only in certain places, and there are only a few spots where flint is to be found (p. 41). For anyone seeking these two indispensable kinds of objects the boundaries of the dialect groups, which are drawn on other occasions, do not exist.

Furthermore, anyone who suffers serious hardship in his own region and is threatened by hunger may, without formality, cross the boundary and supply himself in the neighboring territory. It would be inconceivable for our Yamana to deny anyone access to a place where he can save himself from death by starvation. He is permitted to remain there undisturbed until he can demonstrably find subsistence in his own homeland. The most common causes of temporary calamities are: persistent bad weather /966/ regions where canoe trips are difficult in any case, namely, near the outlying islands; no less frequently, the loss of one's canoe; less often, the death of a wife who leaves a man with several small

/983 cont./

674 the circumstances under which the Indian mentioned had filched the little knife unnoticed and probably immediately swallowed it in order to remain undetected.

685 558 626 The high degree of sensitivity of the Yamana is sufficient to explain why they seriously punish a thief. Thievish actions by one of their people affects them very painfully and unpleasantly, even if they themselves are not harmed by it. The thief is generally despised, and even after many years of irreproachable conduct, he rarely succeeds in improving his reputation. Only in exceptional cases is the thief given a few blows by the injured owner (402).

402. Only Dabbene (b):198 mentions that "the thief is castigated when he is discovered" /translated from Spanish/.

In case of aggravating circumstances, a theft may even lead to a dispute involving several families. In general the Yamana avoid associating with a thief or they turn away from him with unmistakable /984/ aversion, so that, excluded from the society of his nearest fellow-tribesmen, he stands alone (403). This punishment

403. Darwin (d):243 evidently met such an ostracized individual in Goeree Road near Lennox Island. "The man evidently lived by himself and York Minster said he was a bad man who had probably stolen something."

of being ignored and ostracized is more effective than scoldings and whippings.

673 577 The extent to which the Yamana abhor a tendency to steal can be surmized from their urgent warnings to young people, as well as from their many expressions and linguistic subtleties in the designations for stealing. Koppers (d):189 took most of the expressions from BD. "There are words for thief, stealing, robbing. Furthermore for: to cause theft, to accuse of theft, to punish it. Also, however: to return stolen goods, to steal no

2: Cooper E-4 (no date) 1946 SH6 Yahgan SH6

437 [439] [804] [436] rency of any kind, and no weights or measures. Barter was carried on among the *Yahgan* themselves, with the *Ona* and *Alacaluf*, and with the Whites. Barter by exchange of presents was common; a gift was made, regardless often of the wishes of the recipient, who could not refuse it without affronting the giver, and who was definitely expected to give something in return.

768 428 Inheritance played a very minor role. Much or most of the deceased's property was burnt with the body. The person's dog fell to the oldest son or other near relative or acquaintance. Some of the more valuable or useful property might be bartered or given away to distant persons. Such burning, bartering, and giving away were intended to take from sight what would cause sorrow to the surviviors by reminding them of the beloved departed, and to signify the survivors' desire not to profit by the death.

685 Stealing was considered decidedly reprehensible; but thefts actually occurred, even among their own people, not as daily matters, so to speak, but it would seem, not very uncommonly. A habitual thief, who failed to reform, was in the end boycotted—a severe punishment under *Yahgan* living conditions.

574 Generous sharing of food with kin and friends was the rule. Hospitality was extended as a matter of course.

46 **Labor.**—Neither wage nor slave labor existed. There was a little, but not much, labor in common. Each family was a relatively independent economic unit. The division of labor was almost exclusively a sexual one, with no organized or unorganized craftsmen making their living by specialized trades.

462 The man's task was to hunt marine mammals, otter, guanaco, and birds, to make his own weapons, to build and repair the canoe, to do the harder work in hut building. The woman's task was to care for the younger children, to cook, tend the fire and look after the hut generally, to paddle and have general management of the canoe in which the family spent so much of its time, to do all the skinwork and leatherwork, such as preparing skins, sewing clothing, and making skin bags and pouches, to make baskets, and, last but not least, to collect mussels, much of the fish and other sea food, eggs, fungi, and berries. [262] Since mussels were the chief food resource, the woman's part as provider was an extremely important one.

[562] Probably her crucial role as food provider had a good deal to do with her relatively high status in *Yahgan* society. Certain tasks fell to man and woman jointly, such as building the hut, and hunting from the canoe, when the man did the killing while the woman maneuvered the craft. All in all, if we take into account *Yahgan* living conditions, although the list of women's tasks is longer than that of the men's, actually the sexual division of labor appears to have been a fairly equitable one.